



# The NCATE/CAEP Accreditation Process: Theme and Variations

*Presenters:*

*Deborah Eldridge, NCATE Senior Vice President and  
CAEP Senior Vice President for Accreditation and  
Administration*

*Nebraska State BOE Training*

*June 21, 2012*



# Agenda

- A. Update on BOE revised code of conduct
- B. Update on CI and “Moving to Target”
- C. Review of timelines for reporting
- D. AOCs and AFIs: What’s the difference?
- E. Update on CAEP
- F. Questions? Comments? Concerns?

## A. BOE Performance Expectations

- work effectively as a team member,
- use multiple evaluation tools effectively,
- review exhibits electronically,
- have in-depth knowledge of the NCATE standards,
- conduct onsite visits appropriately, and
- be professional in all aspects of their NCATE work.



## A. Code of Conduct


- On the NCATE Website: BOE – [Code of Conduct](#)
  - The Code of Conduct covers:
    - Bias – *maintain impartiality.*
    - Compensation/Gifts - *small tokens only if offered.*
    - Conflict of Interest - *a close, active association is considered a conflict.*
    - Consulting - *be judicious and aware of your limitations in terms of what you can promise.*
    - Confidentiality – *it lasts forever!*

# A. BOE Consulting Policy

- When considering or accepting a personal consulting or similar arrangement with an institution, board members, program reviewers and staff shall:
- not solicit consultation arrangements with institutions preparing for accreditation visits.
- not advertise their status as board members for the purpose of building a consulting clientele.
- not accept a consulting arrangement at an institution for which the member served on the BOE team or on the UAB for at least two years following the accreditation decision.
- ***Sign an NCATE Code of Conduct statement and provide a copy to the institution that states:***
  - that they are not serving as NCATE's agent, but are providing their own professional expertise for consulting purposes.
  - that their advice and recommendations do not guarantee accreditation outcomes.
- restrict consulting fees, if otherwise allowable, to reimbursement of expenses and/or other reasonable and commonly accepted limits.
- refrain from voicing an opinion about the institution to other board members.
- Under no circumstance shall staff accept fees from an institution, though institutions may pay for staff travel when they invite staff to their institutions. If the institution wishes to compensate for a visit by a staff member, payment should be made to NCATE.



# Questions? Comments?



## B. Update on Continuous Improvement (CI)

- **Focus:** Continuous improvement of the programs and practices of a Unit
- **Emphasis:** Moving to target level performance on standard(s) selected by the Unit.
- **Accreditation Decision:** Based on meeting all NCATE standards at the acceptable level with recognition of target performance



## B. Moving Toward Target: Institutional Report and Exhibits

### IR prompts for the unit-selected target standard

- Describe areas of the standard at which the unit is currently performing at the target level.
- Summarize activities and their impact on candidate performance and program quality that have led to target level performance.
- Present plans and the timeline for attaining and/or sustaining target level performance as articulated in the unit standard.



## B. Moving Toward Target: Offsite BOE Report

The Offsite BOE Report template includes the following prompt to be completed only for the standard(s) for which the Unit intends to move toward target level performance:

*x.2 Progress toward meeting the target level on this standard*

The Offsite BOE Team provides feedback on: 1) how well the unit is addressing the standard at the target level and 2) the plans and timeline for moving toward target level performance.

## B. Moving Toward Target: BOE Review and Report

- The BOE Onsite Report will include a new field for recommendation on Movement Toward Target beginning Fall 2012.
- Target. Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in all elements of the standard.
- Moving Toward Target. Clear, convincing and sufficient evidence was presented to demonstrate that the unit is performing at target level in some components and/or elements of the standard with plans and timelines for attaining target level in all elements of the standard.
- Insufficient Progress. Insufficient evidence was provided to demonstrate that the unit is moving toward target level with plans and timelines for attaining target level for the standard.

## B. Current NCATE Standards

1. Candidate knowledge
2. Assessment
3. [Clinical and Field Experiences](#) We looked at the difference in the language for element 3a at the acceptable and target levels to see how the expectations would be increased for “target.”
4. Diversity
5. Faculty
6. Governance and Resources



# Questions? Comments?



## C. Timeline for Completing the BOE Review

Action	Time Frame
Institutional Report (IR) Submitted	6 months prior to the onsite visit
Offsite Meeting	4 to 5 months prior to the onsite visit May-August for fall onsite visits October-January for spring onsite visits
Finalize Offsite BOE Report	Within 2 weeks of the offsite meeting
IR Addendum Submitted	1 to 2 months prior to the onsite visit
Onsite Visit	September-January for fall onsite visits February-May for spring onsite visits
Finalize Onsite BOE Report – Report review by team, team chair, NCATE staff, and institution for factual corrections	52 days following the onsite visit
Institutional Rejoinder	30 days after receipt of final onsite BOE report

## C. Timeline for Completing the BOE Review: Finalizing the Offsite BOE Report

Action	Time Frame
Review IR and Exhibits	IR and exhibits are available 1 month prior to the offsite meeting
Submit assigned section in AIMS	A <u>minimum</u> of 48 hours prior to the offsite meeting. Earlier is preferred.
Review full report during offsite meeting	Up to 4 hours (1-5pm eastern time)
Finalize assigned section based on feedback from the meeting and review full report	Within 2 weeks of offsite meeting



## C. Timeline for Completing the BOE Review: Finalizing the Onsite BOE Report

Action	Time Frame Days after the Onsite Visit
Team reviews and chair submits first draft of the BOE onsite report	1 to 7 days
NCATE staff or affiliated editor edits first draft and provides feedback and submits staff draft	8 to 14 days
Chair integrates comment into draft report as appropriate	15 to 21 days
Chair follows up with team members as necessary	22 to 28 days
Chair submits second draft to the unit for factual correction	29 to 35 days
Units review report and submits factual corrections	36 to 42 days
Chair makes factual corrections and submits final report	43 to 52 days



## C. Resources

- E-Sources
- <http://www.caepsite.org/eresources/player.html>





# Questions? Comments?

## D. Areas of Concern (AOCs) and Areas for Improvement (AFI)

- Areas of Concern (AOCs) - Offsite Report
  - Indicate where the unit *may not* be meeting the standard at the acceptable level based on review of documentation
  - Become Areas for Improvement (AFIs) in final BOE report if not addressed onsite
- Areas for Improvement – Onsite Report
  - Indicate where the unit *is not* meeting the standard at the acceptable level based on the review of documentation and onsite verification in interviews, etc.
  - May lead to the standard being recommended as not met

## D. Areas of Concern (AOCs) and Areas for Improvement (AFIs)

- The AOC and AFI Statement

AOCs and AFIs are standards-based, brief (usually one sentence), and state why the unit is not at the acceptable level.

The AOC in the offsite report is more detailed than an AFI (could be as long as a few sentences)

- The Rationale

- Supports the AOC/AFI by explaining what findings lead the team to cite the AOC/AFI.
- The rationale for an AFI in the final BOE report describes the conditions found at the unit during the onsite visit.

## D. Areas of Concern (AOCs) and Areas for Improvement (AFI)

### Sample AFI:

- The unit does not regularly and systematically collect and analyze candidate performance data to improve candidate performance, program quality, and unit operations.

### Sample Rationale:

- Assessment data are collected by programs and shared with individual faculty and candidates. However, there is no evidence that the data are aggregated or analyzed at the unit level to evaluate overall performance and inform improvements. Faculty acknowledged in interviews that, given its small size, the unit makes changes based predominately on informal discussions and anecdotal evidence.

## D. Areas of Concern (AOCs) and Areas for Improvement (AFI)

Examples of Areas for Improvement:

- <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=%2bi0ncGjU3gQ%3d&tabid=93>

Articles on Areas of Concern and Areas for Improvement in the *BOE Update* Spring 2012:

- <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=UrCMKTnWKUA%3d&tabid=467>



# Questions? Comments?



## E. Current CAEP Standards

1. Candidates demonstrate knowledge...
  2. Data drive decisions...
  3. Resources support learning...
- Harmonization of Standards and Principles
  - Adopted as equivalent to predecessors
  - Basis for CAEP's accreditation decisions



## E. CAEP Tensions

CAEP will need to promote:

- High expectations, not business as usual
- Productive innovation, not compliance
- Choice and experimentation, not regimentation
- Cultures of evidence and improvement, not of accommodation to the accreditor



## E. CAEP Intent

- Building Educator Preparation Provider (EPP) capacity to meet new challenges to the field
- Fewer, clearer, higher expectations that are:
  - Rigorous
  - Transparent
  - Accountable
  - Outcomes-based
  - Inclusive



# E. The CAEP Accreditation Process

## Steps in the CAEP Accreditation Process:

- Eligibility of Educator Preparation Provider (EPP)
  - No longer the NCATE “unit”
- Self-study of EPP completed & evaluated through
  - Formative Feedback and Off-site Review
  - Public Input (call-for-comment & 3<sup>rd</sup> party survey)
  - Onsite Visit with subsequent Report (and response)
- Decision by CAEP Accreditation Council
- Annual Reports submitted and monitored

## E. CAEP Process Features:

- Formative (TEAC)/Off-site (NCATE) Phase
  - Clearer expectations and better initial drafts
  - Earlier feedback to institution on possible issues
  - Accreditation Review visits focused, better informed
- Corroboration through Third Party surveys
  - Constituent input to corroborate EPP claims
- Decision by CAEP Accreditation Council
  - Double review of decisions (NCATE's UAB model)
  - Larger/smaller issues differentiated with decision rules (TEAC model)
- Annual Reports consistent and useful



## E. Pathways to Meeting Standards

- Evidence in self-study must show that the EPP meets all CAEP Standards
- Self-study format selected to emphasize:
  - Inquiry Brief (IB): Research on learning
  - Continuous improvement (CI): Documentation of performance
  - Transformation Initiative (TI): Research on program features



## E. Inquiry Brief (IB)

- **Focus:** Faculty investigation of a) candidate performance, b) quality of evidence, c) use of evidence for program improvement
- **Emphasis:** Meeting 'research-level standard' in the quality of evidence & candidate performance
- **Accreditation Decision:** Based on meeting all CAEP standards with recognition of research-level quality of the evidence presented



## E. Transformation Initiative (TI)

- **Focus:** A broad-based initiative to transform an educator preparation provider's teacher education programs and practices to serve as a model.
- **Emphasis:** Research-centered to inform the profession about best practices and what works.
- **Accreditation Decision:** Based on meeting all CAEP standards with recognition of TI research and innovations

## **E. Summary of CAEP Process for Accreditation Review**

- ALL standards **MUST** be met for accreditation
  - Larger and smaller problems differentiated for EPP
- Program Review options allow State standards to be integrated into accreditation
- Self-study format selection allows institutions
  - Choice in self-study focus and format to match institutional strengths and mission
  - Accountability to national CAEP standards



# Questions? Comments?